

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-16 have been cancelled.

New claim 17 recites that in initial setting operation, the supervision position is arranged to first perform speed detection initial setting and then perform position detection initial setting, and the operation control portion is arranged to be inoperable during the speed detection initial setting, and to cause the car to travel at a lower speed than a speed at the time of normal operation during the position detection initial setting. Basis for this is found in Fig. 3 and on page 10.

Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Keneko et al in view of Angst, Vialonga, Mueller and U.S. patent 5,747,755 (Coste), which was newly cited to teach operating an elevator car at an undefined “very low speed” during an initial setting operation.

Nonetheless, none of the cited prior art teaches the feature of Claims 1 and 7 that the low speed of the elevator car during movement of the car from the floor writing start position during the initial setting operation is equal to or lower than a permissible collision speed with a buffer that receives the car in a lower portion within a hoistway.

According to the Office Action, this feature is taught by the newly cited reference to Coste (“Keneko et al, Angst and Vialonga in combination fail to disclose a low speed lower than a permissible collision speed of a buffer that receives the car in a lower portion within a hoistway. ... However, Coste discloses the operation control portion [that] causes the actual speed of the car to be a low speed lower than a permissible collision speed of a buffer that receives the car in a lower portion within a hoistway”). This is respectfully traversed.

The relevant portion of Coste describes that “during initial installation of the elevator control system’s position reference table, the elevator cab (car) is caused to run at a very low speed using a very low rate of acceleration throughout the entire hoistway.” The Office Action evidently considers the description of a “very low speed” in this portion of Coste to inherently comprise a teaching of a speed lower than a permissible collision speed of a buffer that receives the car in a lower portion within a hoistway. However, there is no technical basis in Coste to support this conclusion; since the value of the “very low speed” is not quantified or defined in Coste, there is no technical basis for concluding that it must necessarily be lower than a permissible collision speed of a buffer that receives the car in a lower portion within a hoistway.

Nor would the necessary teaching be found in Mueller. Claims 5, 11 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Keneko et al in view of Angst, Vialonga, Mueller, Coste and Mueller. According to this rejection, Keneko et al allegedly teaches operating the elevator car such that the speed does not race the drive means, and Mueller allegedly discloses reducing the speed in view of the buffer, whereby “[a]ll the claimed elements were known in the prior art.” This is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that not all the claimed elements were known in the prior art. In particular, it was not known in the prior art to correlate the car speed during the initial operation mode to the permissible collision speed with a buffer. For example, the description in Keneko et al that the car is driven at a speed that does not race the drive means is not a teaching that it is driven at a low speed lower than that during normal operation, particularly a low speed correlated to the permissible collision speed with a buffer. It is merely a description that the motor is not driven at a speed greater than its normal rated speed; a particular low speed is neither taught nor inherent therein.

Mueller also does not teach that it was known in the prior art to limit the car speed during the initial operation mode to the permissible collision speed with a buffer. It is true that paragraph [0011] of Mueller describes a reduced speed of the elevator car, which is related to the buffer length. However, this only refers to the car speed (1) *at the end of car travel*; and (2) *during normal operation* when the car speed is otherwise the high normal speed. Mueller teaches that this high normal speed is reduced at the ends of the car travel during normal operation in order to permit a shorter buffer length. However, this has no relation to the car speed during movement of the car from the floor writing start position in the initial operation mode.


Since the teaching of Mueller is limited to the car speed at the end of travel during normal operation, Mueller would provide *no* teaching for any particular reduced car speed, e.g., a low speed lower than a permissible collision speed of the buffer, during movement of the car from the floor writing start position in the initial operation mode, i.e., when the car is *not* approaching an end of travel position at high speed.

Since neither Coste nor Mueller suggests operating the car at a low speed lower than a permissible collision speed of the buffer during movement of the car from the floor writing start position in the initial operation mode, there is no basis to conclude that this was known or would have been obvious in Keneko et al.

Applicant therefore believes that the present application is in a condition for allowance and respectfully solicits an early notice of allowability.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



---

Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

Robert T. Pous  
Registration No. 29,099  
Attorneys of Record